

and concessions at O'Hare, or Soldier Field, or Millennium Park?

Why not learn from Millennium Park and Soldier Field and exempt O'Hare before the Mayor can do it again? We have a competitive bid proposal for concessions and contracts at O'Hare. It is comprehensive. The Daley-Ryan forces are opposing it. I wonder why that might be?

Maybe Mayor Daley should tell us, before the discussion goes any farther, who's going to pour the concrete at O'Hare? Will it be someone who has been lobbying for the expansion at O'Hare? Who will be hired as consultants or so-called "expeditors"? Who will get a cut of the contracts? Will it be Jeremiah Joyce or will it be Oscar D'Angelo? Who is going to get a piece of the action on the insurance? Is it Mickey Segal or is he too hot right now? What about the bonds? Who is going to rake it in there? Is it Baum and Co., and Tony Fratto? And what about the janitorial contracts? Will that be John Duff, Jr. and his sons, the Duffs?

We have a chance to pass a Federal competitive bid provision for O'Hare in the U.S. Senate. If we pass it, it should mean a markedly different way of doing business in Chicago, at least at O'Hare. There are a number of arguments we will make, and precedents we will review. Mr. President, I look forward to the debate and to continuing to work with my colleagues on that issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer, in his capacity as the Senator from West Virginia, suggests the absence of a quorum.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, are we on the energy bill at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been laid down yet.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### NATIONAL LABORATORIES PARTNERSHIP IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 517, which the clerk will report by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle/Bingaman further modified amendment No. 2917, in the nature of a substitute.

Dayton/Grassley amendment No. 3008 (to amendment No. 2917), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

Landrieu/Kyl amendment No. 3050 (to amendment No. 2917), to increase the transfer capability of electric energy transmission systems through participant-funded investment.

Schumer/Clinton amendment No. 3093 (to amendment No. 2917), to prohibit oil and gas drilling activity in Finger Lakes National Forest, New York.

Dayton amendment No. 3097 (to amendment No. 2917), to require additional findings for FERC approval of an electric utility merger.

Feinstein/Boxer amendment No. 3115 (to amendment No. 2917), to modify the provision relating to the renewable content of motor vehicle fuel to eliminate the required volume of renewable fuel for calendar year 2004.

Murkowski/Breaux/Stevens amendment No. 3132 (to amendment No. 2917), to create jobs for Americans, to reduce dependence on foreign sources of crude oil and energy, to strengthen the economic self determination of the Inupiat Eskimos and to promote national security.

Reid amendment No. 3145 (to amendment No. 3008), to require that Federal agencies use ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel in areas in which ethanol-blended gasoline and biodiesel-blended diesel fuel are available.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3141

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week the Senate adopted an amendment that deals with vehicle efficiency. It deals with the issue of fuel cells. I want to describe the amendment, because I think it is a very important amendment.

The amendment directs the Energy Department to develop a program that would create measurable goals and timetables with the aim of putting 100,000 hydrogen fuel cell vehicles on the road by 2010, and 2.5 million by the year 2020, along with the needed hydrogen infrastructure. DOE would have to report annually on its progress toward achieving these goals.

The amendment is designed to have the Department of Energy work with the auto manufacturers to ensure these goals are met. With this amendment, we are sending a strong signal that our goal is to accelerate and enhance the development of fuel cell vehicles and fuel cell technologies with concrete targets and timetables.

I have asked the question with respect to our energy policy, especially with respect to our transportation sector, about whether our policy is going to be "yesterday forever." I have said on previous occasions—and I will say it again—my first car was an antique 1924 Model T Ford that I bought for \$25 as a young kid, and I restored it. It took me a couple of years to restore that old Model T. But a 1924 Model T Ford is fueled exactly the same way as a current model Ford. You drive up to the

gas pump, stick a hose in the tank, and start pumping. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed in 78 years, and it ought to change.

The issue of how we run our vehicles what kind of engines we use and what kind of fuel we use—we ought to inspire these changes by developing aspirations and national goals with respect to new technologies. I drove a fuel cell car here on the Capitol grounds some months ago. It has essentially a limitless battery that allows you to run the vehicle using this fuel cell. The fuel cell combines hydrogen and oxygen and the only byproduct is water vapor. Fuel cells have the potential to dramatically improve the efficiency of automobiles and dramatically reduce emissions, as opposed to the vehicles that we use now, which have the internal combustion engine we have used for decades after decades.

We can decide that the debate will be a debate about our energy supply, as it has always been. That has been the energy debate we have had for a long while and will be again 25 and 50 years from now, unless we decide to create national aspirations and goals for new technologies.

I believe we ought to do that with respect to automobiles. Our transportation sector consumes the largest amount of energy in our society: about 40 percent of the oil products our Nation consumes each year, or nearly 8 billion barrels of oil each day. In 2001, we imported about 53 to 57 percent of our energy from abroad. That is expected to increase, according to the Energy Information Administration.

So the question is, What do we do about that? Some say we should just adopt CAFE standards. Others say let's develop new technologies. Others say let's not do anything at all. Let's let the marketplace decide who buys what, when, and why.

I think this country ought to encourage the development and the capability to move to a new technology. The Ford Motor Company representative stated that alternative fuel technology has the potential to significantly improve the fuel economy of vehicles, which could reduce U.S. dependence on imported oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and save consumers substantial money at the pump.

Most major automakers are racing to produce prototype fuel cell vehicles. DaimlerChrysler has been talking about this now for several years. They plan to have a fuel cell car in production by the year 2004. California has a Clean Air Act requirement that will ensure that many fuel cell vehicles are going to be on the road. By next year—2003—2 percent of California's vehicles have to be zero-emission vehicles, and around 10 percent of its vehicles must be zero-emission vehicles by 2018. That means California could have nearly 40,000 or 50,000 fuel cell cars on the road by the next decade.

The amendment I offered is supported by the Alliance to Save Energy